DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 364 695 CE 065 184

AUTHOR Donaldson, William S.
TITLE Fast Track. Summer Academic Skills Enhancement Program, 1993. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Columbus Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Evaluation Services.
PUB DATE 93
NOTE 132p.; For the 1992 report, see ED 354 286.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Basic Education; Basic Skills; *Grammar; Pretests Posttests; *Program Effectiveness; *Reading Comprehension; *Remedial Programs; School Holding Power; Skill Development; *Summer Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Job Training Partnership Act 1982

ABSTRACT

The Summer Academic Skills Enhancement Program (SASEP) was offered in June-August 1993 to provide Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) clients with the reading comprehension and language mechanics skills required for employment in entry-level positions. A total of 125 referred clients were enrolled into both of two remedial courses of study. Enrollees were categorized as "regular" (RPA) or "low" pretest achievers (LPA), and specific evaluation objectives were developed for each group. At least 45% of the students in the RPA subset showed a 1.0 grade equivalent (GE) gain on the reading comprehension and language mechanics posttests. Thirty-five percent of the LPA students gained at least 1.0 GE in the reading comprehension posttest, and 42% achieve a 1.0 GE in the language mechanics posttest. Forty-seven percent of the 1993 program participants achieved program completion status (they attended classes 75% of the program days). Program retention demonstrated a 2% drop from 1992. Male/Black retention (81%) was down only 1% from 1992. It was recommended that all SASEP evaluation levels be maintained at their present values but that the definition of program completion be relaxed. (Appended are SASEP pupil attendance and achievement data. Fourteen tables are included.) (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 364 695

Private Industry Council of Franklin County
Job Training Partnership Act

FAST TRACK
FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
SUMMER ACADEMIC SKILLS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM
1993



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D Thompson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Written by:

William S. Donaldson, Ed.D.
Consultant to the Program

Under the Supervision of:

Richard A. Amorose, Ph.D.

Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools
Department of Evaluation Services
Gary Thompson, Ph.D., Director

CE065184

The Columbus City School District does not discriminate because of race, color, national origin, religion, sex or handicap with regard to admission, access, treatment or employment. This policy is applicable in all district programs and activities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Private Industry Council of Franklin County
Job Training Partnership Act

FAST TRACK
FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
SUMMER ACADEMIC SKILLS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM
1993

Abstract

Program Description: The Summer Academic Skills Enhancement Program (SASEP) was funded by the Private Industry Council (PIC) of Franklin County through the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). The purpose of the program was to provide JTPA clients with the Reading Comprehension and Language Mechanics skills required for employment into entry-level positions. A total of 160 curriculum hours were used toward this end. This "Fast Track" program was conducted by the Department of Community Education (DCE), Columbus Public Schools.

Program enrollment was defined by the Private Industry Council. Anticipated were 100 PIC-referred clients. Sixty "completions" were authorized. A total of 125 referred clients were pretested with the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (Form U, Level H). These clients were enrolled into both of two remedial courses-of-study: Reading Comprehension (Houghton-Mifflin New Directions in Reading curriculum) or Language Mechanics (Houghton-Mifflin "whole language" grammar and composition series).

The 1993 program consisted of two segments: testing (May-June) and remediation (June-August). Performance objectives were stated for each of the two remediation programs: Reading Comprehension, Language Mechanics.

Evaluation Design:

1. Evaluation Objectives for "Regular Pretest Achievers" RPA

   1.1 45% of the clients enrolled in the reading component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest Reading Comprehension grade equivalent score between 5.0 and one less than their age-grade placement, will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

   1.2 45% of the clients enrolled in the language component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest Language Mechanics grade equivalent score between 5.0 and one less than their age-grade placement, will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

   1.3 70% of the clients who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest grade equivalent score of 5.0 or more in their component area and who score below 75% on the pretest employment skills test, will score at or above 75% on the employment skills posttest. (N/A in 1993)

   *Age-Grade Placement is the grade the client would be in without retention in grade.

2. Evaluation Objectives for "Low Pretest Achievers" (LPA)

2.1 40% of the clients enrolled in the reading component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest Reading Comprehension grade equivalent score less than 5.0 will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

2.2 40% of the clients enrolled in the language component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest Language Mechanics grade equivalent score less than 5.0, will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

2.3 40% of the clients who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest grade equivalent score of less than 5.0 in their component area and who score below 75% on the pretest employment skills test, will score at or above 75% on the employment skills posttest. (N/A in 1993)

3. Other Evaluation Objectives

3.1 75% of the clients enrolled will attend 75% of the program days.

3.2 80% of the male/black clients enrolled in the program will be retained through the posttesting phase of the project.

3.3 The clients served by the program will reflect the target population such that 25% of the clients will be non-minority.

Major Findings: Pupils in the Regular Pretest Achievers (RPA) subset reached criterion level on both Evaluation Objectives (1.1, 1.2). To be in the RPA subset, a pupil had to have a CTBS pretest GE of at least 5.0. The employment skills test (Objective 1.3) was not administered in 1993.

Pupils in the Low Pretest Achievers (LPA) subset failed to reach criterion level on Evaluation Objective 2.1 and did achieve 2.2. To be in the LPA subset a pupil had to have a CTBS pretest GE less than 5.0. Particularly, 35% (N=6 of 17) of LPA clients in the reading content-area gained at least 1.0 GE at posttesting. In contrast, 42% of these LPA clients did meet the 2.2 language criterion level (40% was required to "reach" this criterion). The employment skills test (Objective 2.3) was not administered in 1993.

Program retention demonstrated a 2% drop from 1992 (67%, down from 69%; 75% was required). Male/Black retention (81%), down 1% from 1992, was an encouraging statistic for the second year in a row. Non-minority recruitment/enrollment/retention (N=1) showed a loss from 1992 and is a major concern.

A pupil attains program completion status by attending 75% of the possible program day and by showing a gain of one or more grade equivalents (GE) on at least one of the three CTBS subtests. In this context, "ceiling effect" continues to confound assessment of achievement gain and to depress the number of clients who achieve program-completion status. As was articulated in the 1991 and 1992 final reports, numerous clients scored at or above 12.0 (grade equivalent on at least one of the three CTBS (UH) tests used to evaluate pretest-to-posttest change. Such a pretest score defeats the program's

purpose on both counts (gain measurement and program completions). See recommendation #2 below.

Fifty-nine clients achieved "program completion" status. This group represents about 47% of the 125 pupils enrolled in the 1993 Summer Program. Data collected during evaluation of program clients suggest that the number of completions could be increased significantly by reducing the attendance requirement from 75% (30 days) to about 60% (say, 23 days). Or, base completion solely on whether a pupil completes all pre- and posttests. Either way, the 1993 Summer Program would have had at the least 8-10 more "completions." This is significant because what is being proposed is an additional 10-15% more completions. Pupils enrolled for less than 30 days, even with perfect attendance, cannot--by definition--become program completions, although they may well gain one or more GE's on one or more of the three tests.

"Enrollment," especially calculation of a percent attending 75% of the instructional days offered, is influenced by a large number of pupils who take the CTBS pretest and then do nothing else. While it may be correct to use the number of clients enrolled as the denominator for calculating "retention" data, it appears probable that (under prevailing selection criteria) the clientele served by this program is unlikely ever to reach an 80% retention level. An alternative algorithm is worth investigating; or, a lower criterion value might be considered.

Recommendations

1. Consideration should be given to exposing future SASEP clients to instruction in both Reading Comprehension and Language Mechanics.

2. It is recommended that a new definition of "completion" be derived and that this definition be applied in 1994, in each instance where high (>=12.0) pretest CTBS GE values so warrant.

3. It is recommended that program sponsors and managers test the viability of using a "completion" definition in the future which is either (a) not dependent on attendance, (b) is relaxed to, say, 60%, a level that would have captured the six pupils lost to attendance in 1993 who did gain at least 1.0 GE, and (c) allows for pupils enrolled for less than the full 39 days of instruction.

4. Criterion levels for all evaluation objectives should remain at their present values for the 1994 SASEP.

5. Continued emphasis on timely enrollment and daily attendance should increase the proportion of 1994 SASEP clients who attain 30 or more days of attendance.

6. Retention of male/black clients should be given high priority for 1994.

7. Program planners for the 1994 SASEP should structure and implement effective, productive strategies for attracting, enrolling and retaining non-minority clients.

Private Industry Council of Franklin County
Job Training Partnership Act

FAST TRACK
FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
SUMMER ACADEMIC SKILLS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM
1993

Program Description

The 1993 FAST TRACK Summer Program consisted of two distinct phases: testing and remediation. The testing phase was designed to identify pre-test performance levels; remediation strategies were adopted to maximize the potential for improving clients' content mastery in two instructional areas: Reading Comprehension (six objectives); (b) Language Mechanics (five objectives). The proposed Program Design statement summarized these two phases as "Testing" and "Remediation". Underlying the remediation phase was a singular goal: provide JTPA clients with the academic skills necessary for "employment into entry level positions."

Employment Skills," an integral part of past PIC Summer Programs, was not offered in 1993.

Referral and Selection

The target group for this program was defined as "JTPA eligible youths aged 14-21".

The selection process was initiated by a referral from the Private Industry Council (PIC). Referrals were tested and the Columbus Public Schools'(CPS) Department of Community Education (DCE) notified PIC regarding performance levels.

An anticipated 100 PIC-identified youth were to be pretested. All PIC referrals were enrolled to attend the eight-week remediation phase beginning in mid-June. The remediation phase was conducted at the North Education Center and emphasized prescriptive/individualized instructional strategies and materials.

Recruitment Methods: The Private Industry Council supplied (by way of the PIC-10 referral form) the Department of Community Education with the names of 125 eligible youth who were chosen or self-identified for participation in the Summer Academic Skills Enhancement Program (SASEP). In April, the Department administered a CTBS battery to those youth. All 125 clients were selected by PIC for the "Fast Track" program. The department also assisted PIC officials with orientation and enrollment.

Testing

Commencing May 3, 1993 and through June 25, 1993, the Department of Community Education administered the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS;1981), Form U, Level H Reading Comprehension, Language Mechanics, and Mathematics Computation subtests to 125 PIC-identified youth. The principal

The Columbus City School District does not discriminate because of race, color, national origin, religion, sex or handicap with regard to admission, access, treatment or employment. This policy is applicable in all district programs and activities.

assessment activity for students enrolled in the Columbus City School District took place at students' home schools. For youth living outside the Columbus City School District or for youth referred after the testing period was closed, testing was administered by PIC personnel at a site designated by PIC management. The Department of Community Education supplied PIC staff with the test instruments and answer sheets.

The Department of Program Evaluation (DPE) of the Columbus Public Schools scored completed answer forms and produced individual diagnostic reports and system summaries. All scores were norm-referenced. The Columbus evaluators used the TESTMATE microcomputer software system to scan, score, and report norm-referenced data.

The Department of Community Education, in concert with the Department of Program Evaluation selected Form U, Level H of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (third edition) as the most appropriate level of difficulty for the identified client group. The CTBS is a norm-referenced achievement test, the content categories of which were defined by examining current state and district curriculum guides, published texts and instructional programs, and criterion-referenced assessment instruments. Columbus evaluation professionals selected the Reading Comprehension, Language Mechanics, and Mathematics Computation subtests for administration to clients. Total time for actual testing was 93 minutes; test administration protocols added approximately 35 minutes to the testing session.

Reading. At the lowest levels, the Reading Comprehension test measures visual and sound recognition of letters, words, vowels, and consonants. Items measuring comprehension skills are related to sentences and stories. Reading Comprehension items measure skills in understanding sentence meaning, passage details, character analysis, main ideas, generalization, written forms, and author techniques. (Houghton-Mifflin's New Directions in Reading)

Language Mechanics. These items measure the student's ability to identify the correct use of capital letters, periods, commas, exclamation points, question marks, quotation marks, colons, semicolons in sentences and in extended passages. (Houghton-Mifflin's "whole language" grammar and composition series)

Testing Methodology Used. The tests' designers used a three-parameter Item Response Theory (IRT) to scale the CTBS and to develop norms. Application of IRT methodology provides a number of direct benefits to the user of CTBS Form U, including more accurate descriptions of client performance. Consultants from the educational community, represented by native American, Asian, Hispanic, and Black ethnic and cultural groups, reviewed all items for possible racial, ethnic, and gender bias. Consequently, the standardized instruments do not contain items that appeared statistically biased in item tryouts. In the standardization, the sample reflects ethnic minorities as they are represented in the general population.

Remediation

One hundred and twenty-five PIC-referred youth were pretested and enrolled in an eight-week summer prescriptive and individualized instructional program at the North Education Center as part of the Summer Youth Employment Training Program operated by the Private Industry Council. Sixty-seven pupils attended

the morning session; 58 pupils attended the afternoon session. The instructional phase of the remedial program took place from June 21, 1993 through August 13, 1993. Those clients who successfully completed course work were eligible to receive 0.5 unit of academic credit for reading, or 0.5 unit of academic credit for Language Mechanics.

Clients attended four hours of classes in Reading Comprehension and Language Mechanics, Monday through Friday (160 instructional hours). All training was delivered by instructors certificated by the State of Ohio.

At the conclusion of the summer instructional phase, staff administered the CTBS (UH) to clients retained to that point. The Department of Program Evaluation analyzed data using appropriate descriptive statistics to determine whether the summer remedial treatment was effective in improving clients' basic academic skills.

The Department of Community Education chose instructional materials based on research findings that have correlated student learning with patterns of curriculum organization. Specifically, researchers discovered that highly structured instructional formats are most effective when working on basic skills competencies with lower achieving students. The following curricula were designed to achieve maximum mastery over a short time through rigorous instructional organization:

Reading Comprehension. The curriculum employed was Houghton-Mifflin's New Directions in Reading program, which has been designed as a Reading Comprehension achievement series for high school students who have not yet mastered Reading Comprehension skills. The three-part instructional plan consists of (a) preparation in vocabulary building, (b) enhancement of comprehension skills through guided reading, and (c) review and extension exercises to verify comprehension and provide skills reinforcement through immediate practice. The comprehension domain is the central focus of each instructional unit, and the curriculum stresses 10 comprehension skills: understanding punctuation, understanding word referents, using context to reveal word meanings, and to understand figurative language, noting important details, understanding sequence of events, recognizing the main idea of paragraphs, making inferences and drawing conclusions or predicting outcomes, understanding cause-effect relationships, understanding comparisons, and distinguishing between fact and opinion. In addition to quizzes for individual lessons, instructors administered both mid-level and end-of-level testing.

Language Mechanics. The language curriculum used Houghton-Mifflin's "whole language" grammar and composition series. This curriculum integrates grammar with reading and writing skills. Grammar units begin with the presentation of the basic lesson, and from that base progresses to vocabulary building activities. These activities are capped by exercises that assist students to make the crucial grammar-writing connection. Students then move to "checkup" activities that assess mastery levels attained. A cumulative review follows, which in turn is supplemented by enrichment work or differentiated additional practice (easy, average, or challenging). Reading and writing units commence with literature selections and are followed by activities that give students practice in using the three modalities of literature response: listening, speaking, and thinking (inferring/drawing conclusions). Composition skills

are taught through the five-step writing process: pre-writing, drafting, revising, proofreading, and publishing (final drafting). Students master spelling skills using Houghton-Mifflin's spelling program, which supports a complete testing program in standardized test format.

Evaluation Design

Pretesting of program candidates was used to discern skills deficiencies in reading, language, and mathematics. Then, clients were enrolled into either or both of two programs: Reading Comprehension or Language Mechanics. Program clients were then guided through the remediation phase as described above. Clients who completed the eight-week instructional program were then posttested to reveal pre/posttest change with respect to Reading Comprehension, Language Mechanics, and Mathematics Computation observed scores.

Because the Summer 1991 Program Evaluation design resolved the so-called "student ID number problem" successfully, this year care again was taken to standardize the number-assignment process. The Department of Program Evaluation (DPE) pre-printed CTBS answer forms and prepared lists of students who were pretested for use by the Summer Program Coordinator. Summer 1993 program personnel used these lists to code student numbers on all forms returned to the DPE for analysis. Thus, it again was possible this year to conduct analysis as intended, analyses based on attendance, where 30 days (75% of 39 enrollments days) of attendance was the cut-off point.

Completion

Two project-completion criteria were evaluated. To be considered a "completion," a client must:

1. attend 75% (N=30) of the 39 enrollment days; and
2. demonstrate a grade-equivalent gain (pretest to posttest) of at least 1.0 on any one of the three CTBS subtests: Reading Comprehension, Language Mechanics, or Mathematics Computation.

Sixty program completions were authorized.

Evaluation Objectives

Nine evaluation objectives were stated in the DCE/CPS 1993 Summer Program proposal. These objectives were initiated by the DPE, following review of the 1992 program. It was suggested that these nine objectives accurately represent the program's potential for measuring clients' CTBS scores. But, expectations for improving CTBS scores should be tempered by an awareness of the wide range of clients' pretest scores and the likelihood of improvement therein.

Thus, evaluation objectives were stated for two groups: Regular Pretest Achievers (RPA; pretest grade-equivalent scores of 5.0 or more), Low Pretest Achievers (LPA; pretest grade-equivalent scores of less than 5.0). Also, objectives regarding Reading Comprehension and Language Mechanics were structured for accommodation of "age-grade placement" (the grade a client would be in without having been retained).

Two planned evaluations (1.3, 2.3) were not conducted because Employment Skills assessment was not included in 1993.

RPA/LPA Rationale.

An SASEP is a remediation-type, short-term learning experience. Of interest to program planners is whether strategies adopted to guide the instructional process work equally well with both RPA and LPA groups.

Prior to 1992, SASEP data analysis did not include provisions for assessment of these two entry-level-split groups. In 1991, following examination of 1990 SASEP data the decision to analyze test results with respect to RPA and LPA membership was proposed for the 1992 SASEP. This analysis plan and the results of its implementation were documented in the 1991 final report submitted to PIC. Because that analysis did reveal some insights useful for program-planning purposes, the same analysis model was used in 1993.

The "5.0 GE" demarcation was arbitrary. It was chosen because observation of 1990 data seemed to indicate that "at around this point" would separate what appeared to be two groups of clients with divergent CTBS pretest scores in reading and language; i.e., frequency distributions of pretest scores were bimodal at approximately GE = 5.0.

And, program planners wanted to know how well the Reading Comprehension program was working with respect to CTBS-measured pre/posttest reading gain; how well the Language Mechanics program was working with respect to pre/posttest language gain. Therefore, each group (RPA/LPA) was assigned one reading (1.1, 2.1) and one language objective (1.2, 2.2).

Age-Grade Placement

Selection into the RPA group was calculated to include pupils who scored higher on the CTBS pretest than those entered into the LPA group, but lower by at least 1.0 GE than students performing at grade-level. Thus, a client in the RPA group was known to be performing lower than would be expected routinely. The rationale used for structuring selection in this way was based on the not remarkable fact that these clients should be excellent targets for realizing the 1.0 GE gain on one of the three CTBS subtests.

So, a 9th-grade client scoring a 9.0 GE for Reading Comprehension would be at "age-grade." Conversely, a 9th-grade client scoring 8.0 GE for Reading Comprehension would be 1.0 behind age-grade. For Evaluation Objectives 2.1-2.3, analyses were based on clients scoring 1.0 or more lower than their respective age-grade placements.

1. Evaluation Objectives for "Regular Pretest Achievers" (RPA)

   1.1 45% of the clients enrolled in the reading component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest Reading Comprehension grade equivalent score between 5.0 and one less than their age-grade placement*, will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

   *Age-Grade Placement is the grade the client would be in without retention in grade.

1.2 45% of the clients enrolled in the language component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest Language Mechanics grade equivalent score between 5.0 and one less than their age-grade placement*, will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

1.3 70% of the clients who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest grade equivalent score of 5.0 or more in their component area and who score below 75% on the pretest employment skills test, will score at or above 75% on the employment skills posttest.

2. Evaluation Objectives for Low Pretest Achievers (LPA)

2.1 40% of the clients enrolled in the reading component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest Reading Comprehension grade equivalent score less than 5.0, will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

2.2 40% of the clients enrolled in the language component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest Language Mechanics grade equivalent score less than 5.0, will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

2.3 40% of the clients who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest grade equivalent score of less than 5.0 in their component area and who score below 75% on the pretest employment skills test, will score at or above 75% on the employment skills posttest.

3. Other Evaluation Objectives

3.1 75% of the clients enrolled will attend 75% of the program days.

3.2 80% of the male/black clients enrolled in the program will be retained through the posttesting phase of the project (excluding clients expelled).

3.3 The clients served by the program will reflect the target population such that 25% of the clients will be non-minority.

Methodology

One hundred twenty-five prospective clients were pretested with the CTBS. Ninety-seven CTBS posttest forms were scored. Demographic and attendance data were recorded on revised Pupil Census Forms (PCF) for all youth pretested with the CTBS. File folder reports for all 125 youth pretested were computer-generated by the Department of Program Evaluation. These reports were customized to include demographic/attendance data and the results of each test taken by the pupil, and to record program-completion status. See the Appendix for examples of the reports provided by DPE.

Achievement data were scanned and scored using TESTMATE computer software. Demographic and attendance data were encoded by this consultant. Preliminary reports to program administration were provided each time new data were added to the datasets. These analyses were conducted using an IBM 9375 running CMS. This hardware and SAS 6.07 were used to analyze CTBS data in terms of grade-equivalent change.

At CTBS pretesting (N=125), 58 (46%) were female and 67 (54%) were male. Regarding ethnicity, 2 (2%) were non-minority and 116 (93%) black. No Asians or American Indians were among the 125 clients in 1993 (see Appendix). Ethnicity was not provided for seven clients, none of whom were members of the evaluation sample.

At CTBS posttesting, 84 clients had at least 30 days of registered attendance, and were split 34 female (40%), 50 male (60%). Proportionately, less females met the attendance criterion than did males.

The Evaluation Sample

To be included in the evaluation sample, a client must have attended at least 30 days of Summer Program Instruction. Since "completion" requires 75% attendance (30 of 39 enrollment days), given that achievement gain is--clearly--a function of being exposed to elements of a formal instructional process, it was determined that the evaluation sample--appropriately--would include only those clients who met this criterion.

For analysis, it was required that a client meeting the attendance criterion also must have pre- and posttest CTBS scores (at least one subtest pair). Therefore, only potential "program completions" were included in the analysis. A total of 84 clients met both evaluation sample eligibility criteria.

Major Findings

The 84 clients (see Appendix) analyzed as the evaluation sample were predominantly black, split about 40%, 60% female/male. One of the two non-minority clients made the sample. A total of 83 black clients were analyzed.

Separate analyses of CTBS data were conducted for each of the evaluation criteria stated earlier. Because the evaluation sample--essentially--is black by ethnic group, further analyses using this variable--ethnicity--were not justified.

Program Completion Analysis

To be designated a program "completion," a client must: (a) attend 75% (30 days) of the enrollment period; and (b) show a grade-equivalent gain of at least 1.0 on one or more subtests (pre/posttest) of the CTBS. The evaluation sample included 84 clients with data sufficient to test for program completion. (A client missing the CTBS posttest could not become a "completion," by PIC definition).

This completion-candidate group of 84 clients consisted of 34 (40%) females, 50 (60%) males, 83 (99%) blacks; of the black group 33 (40%) were female and 50 (60%) were males. All 84 completion candidates were enrolled in both instructional areas: Reading Comprehension and Language Mechanics.

Fifty-nine (70% of the evaluation sample) clients achieved completion status, 25 females and 34 males. Fifty-eight of these 59 were black. Twenty-five (74%) of black/female completion candidates did reach program completion status; 34 (68%) of males/black were completions.

A total of 85 "G.E.>=1.0" gains were observed for 84 clients across the three content-area types: reading = 30 (36% of 84), language = 41 (49%) and math = 14 (17%).

Eighty-four clients were program-completion candidates (≥ 30 days of attendance and valid posttest minus pretest score). Fifty-nine (70%) of the 84 achieved program completion. Among the 84 candidates, 85 difference scores >=1.0 were observed; in fact, all 85 difference-score "completions" were observed among the 84 clients who achieved program-completion status. This same finding was reported in 1992. The correlation between attendance 75% of the time and completion in one or more areas remains impressive.

How does a gain >=1.0 in, for example, reading relate to language and math? Consider Table 1, where RCG is Reading Comprehension gain, LMG is Language Mechanics gain. RCG, LMG, and MCG = 1 if gain >=1.0. This table also includes the variable "COMPL" which is a "1" if program completion was achieved. The correlation between reading and language gain >=1.0 is 0.17, and the likelihood of pairing program completion with RCG is 0.49; program completion and LMG correlate 0.64. None of the RCG/LMG/MCG correlations suggest strong relationships. Thus, gain >=1.0 in any one content area appears--essentially--unrelated to that in either of the other two areas. Data reported here is quite consistent with that reported in 1992.

The narrative in the remainder of this report references Tables 1-14. The following variable names are used in these tables.

Variable Name	Comments
ATTEND	Number of days of attendance.
ATT	Attend 30 days = YES, NO otherwise.
PROG	Instructional curriculum.
ETHNIC	Ethnic group.
GERCA	Grade equivalent, Reading Comprehension pretest.
GERCB	Grade equivalent, Reading Comprehension posttest.
GELMA	Grade equivalent, Language Mechanics pretest.
GELMB	Grade equivalent, Language Mechanics posttest.
GEMCA	Grade equivalent, Math Computation pretest.
GEMCB	Grade equivalent, Math Computation posttest.
AGEGR	Age-Grade.
AGEGRPLA	Age-Grade placement.
RCG	Reading Comprehension gain; ≥1.0 GE = YES, NO otherwise.
LMG	Language Mechanics gain; ≥1.0 GE = Yes, NO otherwise.
MCG	Math Computation gain; ≥1.0 GE = YES, NO otherwise.
SEX	Gender; M=male, F=female
COMPL	Program Completion 1=Yes, NO otherwise

Table 2 presents pertinent frequencies for the 125 FAST TRACK clients who constituted the "potential" completions group. Table 3 presents both pre- and posttest descriptive statistics for the "Base Means", where base is a term used to identify all 125 Fast Track clients as a group. Next, (see Table 4) the same variable frequencies displayed for the "non-completion" subsets.

And, Table 5 presents similar frequencies for the "completion" subset. Table 6 shows means and other descriptive statistics useful for comparison with the base-means in Table 3.

Regarding data in Table 6, note the almost nine-day difference in attendance. On average, Fast Track clients who completed the 1993 Summer Program missed slightly more than three of the 39 instructional days. Non-completion clients missed nearly 13 days, on average.

Average pretest scores in Reading Comprehension were higher in the non-completion group than in the completion group. However, pretest-to-posttest "gain" (defined in terms of the observed change in grade-equivalent scores measured), is--essentially--zero for members of the non-completion group. The Reading Comprehension (1.86) and Language Mechanics (2.78) "gains" for the completion group are above 0.50 and well above those observed in 1992. Perhaps being in both instructional programs influenced "gain" in both in 1993. Gain in Math Computation was 0.09 for the completion group.

Table 7 displays pertinent frequencies for members of the evaluation sample (N=84). The sample has only one non-black member (no Asians or American Indians). Fifty-eight of the 59 program completions are black; 34 (40%) are female and 50 (60%) are male. The common factor, of course, is 30 or more days attendance by all members of the evaluation sample. Moreover, 59(70%) of the 84 members of the evaluation sample gained at least 1.0 GE on at least one of the three tests, an increase of 3% from 1992.

Evaluation Objectives for "Regular Pretest Achievers" RPA

1.1 45% of the clients enrolled in the reading component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest Reading Comprehension grade equivalent score between 5.0 and one less than their age-grade placement, will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

A total of 17 clients were in this group. Each of the 17 had an age-grade placement exactly one less than age-grade. These are clients who were enrolled in both content areas and whose pretest score suggested one year of retention.

Twelve of the 17 possible completions (71%) from this group were realized. Ten of the 17 (59%) were Reading Comprehension completions (see Table 8), clients who gained at least 1.0 GE from pretest to posttest.

This criterion was reached.

1.2 45% of the clients enrolled in the language component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest Language Mechanics grade equivalent score between 5.0 and one less than their age-grade placement, will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

This objective is nearly identical to E.O. 1.1, the only exception being that the content area Language Mechanics is of interest. Twelve clients enrolled in Language Mechanics constitute this group. Of these 12, 10

(83%) were program completions. Nine of the twelve (75%) were Language Mechanics completions (see Table 9).

This criterion was reached.

1.3 70% of the clients who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest grade equivalent score of 5.0 or more in their component area and who score below 75% on the pretest employment skills test, will score at or above 75% on the employment skills posttest.

The 1993 Fast Track Summer Program did not include Employment Skills instruction. E.O. 1.3 was not evaluated.

Evaluation Objectives for "Low Pretest Achievers" (LPA)

2.1 40% of the clients enrolled in the reading component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest Reading Comprehension grade equivalent score less than 5.0 will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

Seventeen LPA clients enrolled in the Reading Comprehension content also had reading pretest-scores of less than 5.0 GE. Of these 17, 10(59%) were program completions. But, only 6 of the 10 completions were associated with a gain of 1.0 GE or more pretest-to-posttest in Reading Comprehension. Thus, 6 of 17 (35%) met this criterion (see Table 10).

This criterion was not reached.

2.2 40% of the clients enrolled in the language component who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest Language Mechanics grade equivalent score less than 5.0, will show 1.0 grade equivalent gain on the posttest.

Thirty-eight LPA clients from the evaluation sample (45%) were enrolled in the Language Mechanics content area, all of whom had a language pretest score of less than 5.0. Twenty-five (66%) were program completions, 16 (42%) of whom were completions in Language Mechanics (see Table 11).

This criterion was reached.

2.3 40% of the clients who attend 75% of the program days and who have a CTBS pretest grade equivalent score of less than 5.0 in their component area and who score below 75% on the pretest employment skills test, will score at or above 75% on the employment skills posttest.

The 1993 Fast Track Summer Program did not include Employment Skills instruction. E.O. 2.3 was not evaluated.

Other Evaluation Objectives

3.1 75% of the clients enrolled will attend 75% of the program days.

Of the 125 clients enrolled in the 1993 Fast Track Summer Program, 84 (67%) attended at least the minimum of 30 days needed toward program completion. This represents a 2% loss from 1992 (see Table 12).

This criterion was not reached.

3.2 80% of the male/black clients enrolled in the program will be retained through the posttesting phase of the project.

Sixty-two male/blacks enrolled in one or more program content areas and were pretested. Of these 62, only 12 (19%) were not posttested. This is an improvement for the second year in a row (see Table 13).

This criterion was reached.

3.3 The clients served by the program will reflect the target population such that 25% of the clients will be non-minority.

Only one non-minority (white) client was enrolled and posttested as a member of the evaluation sample (see Table 14).

This criterion was not reached.

Summary/Recommendations

Nine evaluation objectives (E.O.) were proposed for assessment of the 1993 Summer Academic Skills Enhancement Program(SASEP). Two of these (1.3, 2.3) were dependent upon measurement of Employment-Skills items. Because the 1993 program did not include instruction (or measurement) in the Employment Skills area, summer-program assessment was based on the remaining seven E.O.'s.

These seven E.O.'s were identical to those used for assessment of the 1992 SASEP; comparison of results from 1992 to 1993 is possible.

Seventy percent (59 of 84) of the attendance-eligible clients achieved (at least) a gain of 1.0 grade equivalent (pretest to posttest) on at least one of the three measurements (Reading Comprehension, Language Mechanics, Math Computation). This number (70%) represents a 3% gain from 1992. That 59 SASEP clients became completions speaks well for the program. This represents an increase of 26 completions from 1992. Most of this increase, however, is probably due to the increased number of clients enrolled into the program and who attended 30 or more days of instruction. The evaluation sample in 1992 numbered 49 (of 71, 69%) and 84 (of 125, 67%) in 1993. Perhaps some of the 3% increase in completions is due to the fact that all FAST TRACK clients received instruction in both Reading Comprehension and Language Mechanics in 1993. Empirical definitiveness in this context is beyond the scope of this report.

Consideration should be given to exposing future SASEP clients to instruction in both Reading Comprehension and Language Mechanics.

As was true in 1992 (and before), the issue of "program completion" arises again. Recruitment of clients into the 1993 SASEP included a total of 21 pupils who scored at least 12.0 GE on one or more of the three CTBS pretest

categories. Each instance, of course, makes impossible the opportunity for "completion" to occur in that specific content area. Of these 21, seven clients did achieve program completion anyway. Eight of the 14 remaining did not achieve attendance completion. Thus, six (attendance completion, no program completion) were lost: could not become program completions due to high pretest scores (see Appendix).

These 21 clients totaled 26 pretest GE values of 12.0 or higher. Therefore, of the 65 (21*3) possible GE values for these clients only 37 "completions" really were available.

These recommendations were presented in the 1992 Final Report and are equally important to this report:

> "One thing is certain: "completions," per se, under the current mandates, consistently will underestimate positive gains made by SASEPs."
>
> It is recommended that a new definition of "completion" be derived and that this definition be applied in 1994, in each instance where high (>=12.0) pretest CTBS GE values so warrant.
>
> It is recommended that program sponsors and managers test the viability of using a "completion" definition in the future which is either (a) not dependent on attendance, (b) is relaxed to, say, 60%, a level that would have captured the six pupils lost to attendance in 1993 who did gain at least 1.0 GE, and (c) allows for pupils enrolled for less than the full 39 days of instruction.

Both "Regular Pretest Achievers" (RPA) objectives were reached. Objective 2.2 was reached (was not in 1992); "Low Pretest Achievers" (LPA) were only 5% short on 2.1, an increase of 17% from 1992. Clearly, LPA clients fared much better on both objectives in 1993 than in 1992.

Sixty-seven percent (84) of those enrolled (125) achieved attendance completion, 2% less than in 1992 (3.1). Eighty-one percent (50) of the 62 male/blacks enrolled were posttested (3.2). The one non-minority client enrolled, posttested (completion) suggests a lack of recruitment effort.

> Criterion levels for all evaluation objectives should remain at their present values for the 1994 SASEP.

Sixty-seven percent (84) of the 125 Fast Track clients in 1993 attended at least 30 days of formal instruction. This represents a 5% decrease from 1992. Client attendance beginning with day one is important.

> Continued emphasis on timely enrollment and daily attendance should increase the proportion of 1994 SASEP clients who attain 30 or more days of attendance.

A gain of four percent was made this year in terms of the number of male/black enrollments who were retained through posttesting. Clearly, progress was made again in 1993. Since about one-half of all enrollments were

male/black, it is worthy to reiterate increased emphasis on retention of this particular group.

> Retention of male/black clients should be given high priority for 1994.

Enrollment of non-minority clients (N=1) fell to its lowest level ever. This program no longer serves a non-minority clientele. The recommendation made in 1992 in this regard is repeated:

> Program planners for the 1994 SASEP should structure and implement effective, productive strategies for attracting, enrolling and retaining non-minority clients.

Table 1

Correlation of Program Completion and Difference-Score Gain

(All Variables are Dichotomous*)

	COMPL	RCG	LMG	MCG
RCG	0.49	1.00	0.17	0.00
LMG	0.64	0.17	1.00	-0.05
MCG	0.29	0.00	-0.05	1.00

* N=84 for each variable

Prepared by
Office of the Deputy Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation

Table 2

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

All FAST TRACK Data - FTK + FT2 SASDATA Files

Assess Data with Respect to Evaluation Proposed Objectives
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Base Frequencies

Gender

SEX	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
F	58	46.4	58	46.4
M	67	53.6	125	100.0

Ethnic Group

ETHNIC	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Non-Minority	2	1.7	2	1.7
Black	116	98.3	118	100.0

Frequency Missing = 7

SEX	ETHNIC	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
F	Non-Minority	1	0.8	1	0.8
F	Black	54	45.8	55	46.6
M	Non-Minority	1	0.8	56	47.5
M	Black	62	52.5	118	100.0

Frequency Missing = 7

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 2 (cont'd)
1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

All FAST TRACK Data - FTK + FT2 SASDATA Files

Assess Data with Respect to Evaluation Proposed Objectives
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Base Frequencies

Actual Attendance

ATTEND	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	1	0.8	1	0.8
2	2	1.7	3	2.5
4	1	0.8	4	3.4
5	1	0.8	5	4.2
7	1	0.8	6	5.1
9	1	0.8	7	5.9
10	1	0.8	8	6.8
12	1	0.8	9	7.6
14	1	0.8	10	8.5
16	1	0.8	11	9.3
17	1	0.8	12	10.2
19	1	0.8	13	11.0
21	2	1.7	15	12.7
23	2	1.7	17	14.4
24	3	2.5	20	16.9
25	1	0.8	21	17.8
26	2	1.7	23	19.5
27	3	2.5	26	22.0
28	3	2.5	29	24.6
28.5	1	0.8	30	25.4
29	2	1.7	32	27.1
30	2	1.7	34	28.8
31	4	3.4	38	32.2
32	5	4.2	43	36.4
33	11	9.3	54	45.8
34	9	7.6	63	53.4
35	4	3.4	67	56.8
36	8	6.8	75	63.6
37	18	15.3	93	78.8
37.5	2	1.7	95	80.5
38	9	7.6	104	88.1
38.5	1	0.8	105	89.0
39	13	11.0	118	100.0

Frequency Missing = 7

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 3

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

All FAST TRACK Data - FTK + FT2 SASDATA Files

Assess Data with Respect to Evaluation Proposed Objectives
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Base Means

Variable	Label	N	Nmiss	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum	Range
ETHNIC	Ethnic Group	118	7	1.98	0.13	1.00	2.00	1.00
ATTEND	Actual Attendance	118	7	31.15	9.16	1.00	39.00	38.00
GERCA	PRE Grade Eq.-Read. Comp.	125	0	7.52	2.78	4.00	12.90	8.90
GERCB	POS Grade Eq.-Read. Comp.	97	28	8.02	2.99	4.00	12.90	8.90
RCG	Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Reading	125	0	0.26	0.44	0.00	1.00	1.00
GELMA	PRE Grade Eq.-Lang. Mech.	125	0	6.31	2.71	4.00	12.90	8.90
GELMB	POS Grade Eq.-Lang. Mech.	97	28	8.16	3.49	4.00	12.90	8.90
LMG	Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Language	125	0	0.35	0.48	0.00	1.00	1.00
GEMCA	PRE Grade Eq.-Math. Comp.	124	1	7.04	1.77	4.30	12.90	8.60
GEMCB	POS Grade Eq.-Math. Comp.	97	28	7.12	1.82	4.30	12.90	8.60
MCG	Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Math	125	0	0.14	0.35	0.00	1.00	1.00
COMPL	Completion	125	0	0.47	0.50	0.00	1.00	1.00

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 4

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

All FAST TRACK Data - FTK + FT2 SASDATA Files

Assess Data with Respect to Evaluation Proposed Objectives
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Completion Group Frequencies

---------- Completion=NO ----------

Gender

SEX	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
F	33	50.0	33	50.0
M	33	50.0	66	100.0

Ethnic Group

ETHNIC	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Non-Minority	1	1.7	1	1.7
Black	58	98.3	59	100.0

Frequency Missing = 7

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 4 (cont'd)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

All FAST TRACK Data - FTK + FT2 SASDATA Files

Assess Data with Respect to Evaluation Proposed Objectives
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Completion Group Frequencies

---------- Completion=NO ----------

TABLE OF SEX BY ETHNIC

SEX(Gender) ETHNIC(Ethnic Group)

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Non-Minority	Black	Total
F	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	30 50.85 100.00 51.72	30 50.85
M	1 1.69 3.45 100.00	28 47.46 96.55 48.28	29 49.15
Total	1 1.69	58 98.31	59 100.00

Frequency Missing = 7

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 4 (cont'd)
1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

All FAST TRACK Data - FTK + FT2 SASDATA Files

Assess Data with Respect to Evaluation Proposed Objectives
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Completion Group Frequencies

---------- Completion=NO ----------

Actual Attendance

ATTEND	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	1	1.7	1	1.7
2	2	3.4	3	5.1
4	1	1.7	4	6.8
5	1	1.7	5	8.5
7	1	1.7	6	10.2
9	1	1.7	7	11.9
10	1	1.7	8	13.6
12	1	1.7	9	15.3
14	1	1.7	10	16.9
16	1	1.7	11	18.6
17	1	1.7	12	20.3
19	1	1.7	13	22.0
21	2	3.4	15	25.4
23	2	3.4	17	28.8
24	3	5.1	20	33.9
25	1	1.7	21	35.6
26	2	3.4	23	39.0
27	3	5.1	26	44.1
28	3	5.1	29	49.2
28.5	1	1.7	30	50.8
29	2	3.4	32	54.2
31	3	5.1	35	59.3
32	2	3.4	37	62.7
33	2	3.4	39	66.1
34	5	8.5	44	74.6
35	2	3.4	46	78.0
36	1	1.7	47	79.7
37	7	11.9	54	91.5
39	5	8.5	59	100.0

Frequency Missing = 7

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 4 (cont'd)
1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

All FAST TRACK Data - FTK + FT2 SASDATA Files

Assess Data with Respect to Evaluation Proposed Objectives
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Completion Group Frequencies

---------- Completion=NO ----------

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	39	59.1	39	59.1
YES	27	40.9	66	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 5

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

All FAST TRACK Data - FTK + FT2 SASDATA Files

Assess Data with Respect to Evaluation Proposed Objectives
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Completion Group Frequencies

---------- Completion=YES ----------

Gender

SEX	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
F	25	42.4	25	42.4
M	34	57.6	59	100.0

Ethnic Group

ETHNIC	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Non-Minority	1	1.7	1	1.7
Black	58	98.3	59	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 5 (cont'd)
1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

All FAST TRACK Data - FTK + FT2 SASDATA Files

Assess Data with Respect to Evaluation Proposed Objectives
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Completion Group Frequencies

---------- Completion=YES ----------

TABLE OF SEX BY ETHNIC

SEX(Gender) ETHNIC(Ethnic Group)

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Non-Minority	Black	Total
F	1	24	25
	1.69	40.68	42.37
	4.00	96.00	
	100.00	41.38	
M	0	34	34
	0.00	57.63	57.63
	0.00	100.00	
	0.00	58.62	
Total	1	58	59
	1.69	98.31	100.00

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 5 (cont'd)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

All FAST TRACK Data - FTK + FT2 SASDATA Files

Assess Data with Respect to Evaluation Proposed Objectives
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Completion Group Frequencies

---------- Completion=YES ----------

Actual Attendance

ATTEND	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
30	2	3.4	2	3.4
31	1	1.7	3	5.1
32	3	5.1	6	10.2
33	9	15.3	15	25.4
34	4	6.8	19	32.2
35	2	3.4	21	35.6
36	7	11.9	28	47.5
37	11	18.6	39	66.1
37.5	2	3.4	41	69.5
38	9	15.3	50	84.7
38.5	1	1.7	51	86.4
39	8	13.6	59	100.0

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	59	100.0	59	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 6

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

All FAST TRACK Data - FTK + FT2 SASDATA Files

Assess Data with Respect to Evaluation Proposed Objectives
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Completion Group Means

Completion=NO

Variable	Label	N	Nmiss	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum	Range
ETHNIC	Ethnic Group	59	7	1.98	0.13	1.00	2.00	1.00
ATTEND	Actual Attendance	59	7	26.43	10.83	1.00	39.00	38.00
GERCA	PRE Grade Eq.-Read. Comp.	66	0	7.51	2.98	4.00	12.90	8.90
GERCB	POS Grade Eq.-Read. Comp.	38	28	6.95	3.12	4.00	12.90	8.90
RCG	Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Reading	66	0	0.03	0.17	0.00	1.00	1.00
GELMA	PRE Grade Eq.-Lang. Mech.	66	0	6.35	2.95	4.00	12.90	8.90
GELMB	POS Grade Eq.-Lang. Mech.	38	28	6.47	3.33	4.00	12.90	8.90
LMG	Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Language	66	0	0.05	0.21	0.00	1.00	1.00
GEMCA	PRE Grade Eq.-Math. Comp.	66	0	7.22	1.81	4.30	12.90	8.60
GEMCB	POS Grade Eq.-Math. Comp.	38	28	7.06	2.04	4.30	12.90	8.60
MCG	Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Math	66	0	0.06	0.24	0.00	1.00	1.00
COMPL	Completion	66	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Completion=YES

Variable	Label	N	Nmiss	Mean	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum	Range
ETHNIC	Ethnic Group	59	0	1.98	0.13	1.00	2.00	1.00
ATTEND	Actual Attendance	59	0	35.87	2.54	30.00	39.00	9.00
GERCA	PRE Grade Eq.-Read. Comp.	59	0	7.53	2.56	4.00	12.90	8.90
GERCB	POS Grade Eq.-Read. Comp.	59	0	8.71	2.71	4.00	12.90	8.90
RCG	Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Reading	59	0	0.51	0.50	0.00	1.00	1.00
GELMA	PRE Grade Eq.-Lang. Mech.	59	0	6.27	2.44	4.00	12.90	8.90
GELMB	POS Grade Eq.-Lang. Mech.	59	0	9.25	3.15	4.00	12.90	8.90
LMG	Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Language	59	0	0.69	0.46	0.00	1.00	1.00
GEMCA	PRE Grade Eq.-Math. Comp.	58	1	6.84	1.73	4.30	12.50	8.20
GEMCB	POS Grade Eq.-Math. Comp.	59	0	7.15	1.68	4.30	12.90	8.60
MCG	Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Math	59	0	0.24	0.43	0.00	1.00	1.00
COMPL	Completion	59	0	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

41

Table 7

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Sample Frequencies

Gender

SEX	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
F	34	40.5	34	40.5
M	50	59.5	84	100.0

Ethnic Group

ETHNIC	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Non-Minority	1	1.2	1	1.2
Black	83	98.8	84	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 7 (cont'd)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Sample Frequencies

TABLE OF SEX BY ETHNIC

SEX(Gender) ETHNIC(Ethnic Group)

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Non-Minority	Black	Total
F	1 1.19 2.94 100.00	33 39.29 97.06 39.76	34 40.48
M	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	50 59.52 100.00 60.24	50 59.52
Total	1 1.19	83 98.81	84 100.00

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 7 (cont'd)
1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Sample Frequencies

Actual Attendance

ATTEND	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
30	2	2.4	2	2.4
31	2	2.4	4	4.8
32	5	6.0	9	10.7
33	11	13.1	20	23.8
34	9	10.7	29	34.5
35	4	4.8	33	39.3
36	8	9.5	41	48.8
37	18	21.4	59	70.2
37.5	2	2.4	61	72.6
38	9	10.7	70	83.3
38.5	1	1.2	71	84.5
39	13	15.5	84	100.0

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	84	100.0	84	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 8

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 1.1 Frequencies Reading Clients - RPA

Actual Attendance

ATTEND	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
30	1	5.9	1	5.9
31	1	5.9	2	11.8
33	3	17.6	5	29.4
34	1	5.9	6	35.3
36	3	17.6	9	52.9
37	4	23.5	13	76.5
39	4	23.5	17	100.0

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	17	100.0	17	100.0

Age-Grade

AGEGR	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
7	10	58.8	10	58.8
8	6	35.3	16	94.1
9	1	5.9	17	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 8 (cont'd)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 1.1 Frequencies Reading Clients - RPA

Age-Grade Placement

AGEGRPLA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
6	10	58.8	10	58.8
7	6	35.3	16	94.1
8	1	5.9	17	100.0

PRE Grade Eq.-Read. Comp.

GERCA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
5	1	5.9	1	5.9
5.2	2	11.8	3	17.6
5.3	4	23.5	7	41.2
5.4	4	23.5	11	64.7
5.6	1	5.9	12	70.6
5.7	1	5.9	13	76.5
5.8	2	11.8	15	88.2
6.2	1	5.9	16	94.1
7.3	1	5.9	17	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 8 (cont'd)
1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 1.1 Frequencies Reading Clients - RPA

POS Grade Eq.-Read. Comp.

GERCB	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
4.7	2	11.8	2	11.8
5	1	5.9	3	17.6
5.4	1	5.9	4	23.5
5.6	1	5.9	5	29.4
5.7	1	5.9	6	35.3
6.5	2	11.8	8	47.1
8.7	1	5.9	9	52.9
8.9	1	5.9	10	58.8
9.1	3	17.6	13	76.5
9.3	1	5.9	14	82.4
9.6	1	5.9	15	88.2
9.9	2	11.8	17	100.0

Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Reading

RCG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	7	41.2	7	41.2
YES	10	58.8	17	100.0

Completion

COMPL	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	5	29.4	5	29.4
YES	12	70.6	17	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 9

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 1.2 Frequencies Language Clients - RPA

Actual Attendance

ATTEND	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
32	1	8.3	1	8.3
33	2	16.7	3	25.0
34	1	8.3	4	33.3
35	1	8.3	5	41.7
36	2	16.7	7	58.3
37	3	25.0	10	83.3
38	1	8.3	11	91.7
39	1	8.3	12	100.0

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	12	100.0	12	100.0

Age-Grade

AGEGR	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
7	7	58.3	7	58.3
8	4	33.3	11	91.7
9	1	8.3	12	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 9 (cont'd)
1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 1.2 Frequencies Language Clients - RPA

Age-Grade Placement

AGEGRPLA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
6	7	58.3	7	58.3
7	4	33.3	11	91.7
8	1	8.3	12	100.0

PRE Grade Eq.-Lang. Mech.

GELMA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
5	2	16.7	2	16.7
5.3	4	33.3	6	50.0
5.6	5	41.7	11	91.7
7.9	1	8.3	12	100.0

POS Grade Eq.-Lang. Mech.

GELMB	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
4.3	1	8.3	1	8.3
4.8	1	8.3	2	16.7
7.3	1	8.3	3	25.0
7.9	2	16.7	5	41.7
8.4	2	16.7	7	58.3
10.8	1	8.3	8	66.7
11.8	1	8.3	9	75.0
12.9	3	25.0	12	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 9 (cont'd)
1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 1.2 Frequencies Language Clients - RPA

Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Language

LMG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	3	25.0	3	25.0
YES	9	75.0	12	100.0

Completion

COMPL	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	2	16.7	2	16.7
YES	10	83.3	12	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 10

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 2.1 Frequencies Reading Clients - LPA

Actual Attendance

ATTEND	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
30	1	5.9	1	5.9
32	1	5.9	2	11.8
33	1	5.9	3	17.6
34	2	11.8	5	29.4
35	1	5.9	6	35.3
36	2	11.8	8	47.1
37	2	11.8	10	58.8
38	3	17.6	13	76.5
38.5	1	5.9	14	82.4
39	3	17.6	17	100.0

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	17	100.0	17	100.0

Age-Grade

AGEGR	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
7	8	47.1	8	47.1
8	6	35.3	14	82.4
9	3	17.6	17	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 10 (cont'd)
1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 2.1 Frequencies Reading Clients - LPA

Age-Grade Placement

AGEGRPLA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
6	8	47.1	8	47.1
7	6	35.3	14	82.4
8	3	17.6	17	100.0

PRE Grade Eq.-Read. Comp.

GERCA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
4	12	70.6	12	70.6
4.3	2	11.8	14	82.4
4.6	1	5.9	15	88.2
4.7	2	11.8	17	100.0

POS Grade Eq.-Read. Comp.

GERCB	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
4	8	47.1	8	47.1
4.7	2	11.8	10	58.8
5	2	11.8	12	70.6
5.6	1	5.9	13	76.5
5.8	1	5.9	14	82.4
8.7	1	5.9	15	88.2
8.9	1	5.9	16	94.1
12.9	1	5.9	17	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 10 (cont'd)
1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 2.1 Frequencies Reading Clients - LPA

Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Reading

RCG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	11	64.7	11	64.7
YES	6	35.3	17	100.0

Completion

COMPL	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	7	41.2	7	41.2
YES	10	58.8	17	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 11

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 2.2 Frequencies Language Clients - LPA

Actual Attendance

ATTEND	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
30	2	5.3	2	5.3
31	1	2.6	3	7.9
32	3	7.9	6	15.8
33	2	5.3	8	21.1
34	4	10.5	12	31.6
35	2	5.3	14	36.8
36	6	15.8	20	52.6
37	8	21.1	28	73.7
38	4	10.5	32	84.2
38.5	1	2.6	33	86.8
39	5	13.2	38	100.0

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	38	100.0	38	100.0

Age-Grade

AGEGR	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
7	21	55.3	21	55.3
8	13	34.2	34	89.5
9	4	10.5	38	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 11 (cont'd)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 2.2 Frequencies Language Clients - LPA

Age-Grade Placement

AGEGRPLA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
6	21	55.3	21	55.3
7	13	34.2	34	89.5
8	4	10.5	38	100.0

PRE Grade Eq.-Lang. Mech.

GELMA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
4	28	73.7	28	73.7
4.3	3	7.9	31	81.6
4.5	5	13.2	36	94.7
4.8	2	5.3	38	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 11 (cont'd)
1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 2.2 Frequencies Language Clients - LPA

POS Grade Eq.-Lang. Mech.

GELMB	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
4	16	42.1	16	42.1
4.3	1	2.6	17	44.7
4.5	2	5.3	19	50.0
4.8	2	5.3	21	55.3
5	1	2.6	22	57.9
5.6	1	2.6	23	60.5
6.1	3	7.9	26	68.4
7.9	1	2.6	27	71.1
8.4	1	2.6	28	73.7
9	1	2.6	29	76.3
10.1	4	10.5	33	86.8
10.8	1	2.6	34	89.5
11.8	2	5.3	36	94.7
12.9	2	5.3	38	100.0

Gained at Least 1.0 GE in Language

LMG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	22	57.9	22	57.9
YES	16	42.1	38	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 11 (cont'd)
1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 2.2 Frequencies Language Clients - LPA

Completion

COMPL	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	13	34.2	13	34.2
YES	25	65.8	38	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 12

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 3.1 - Attendance

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	84	100.0	84	100.0

Ethnic Group

ETHNIC	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Non-Minority	1	1.2	1	1.2
Black	83	98.8	84	100.0

Gender

SEX	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
F	34	40.5	34	40.5
M	50	59.5	84	100.0

Completion

COMPL	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	25	29.8	25	29.8
YES	59	70.2	84	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 12 (cont'd)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 3.1 - Attendance

TABLE OF ATT BY ETHNIC

ATT(Attended 30 or More Days)
ETHNIC(Ethnic Group)

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Non-Minority	Black	Total
YES	1 1.19 1.19 100.00	83 98.81 98.81 100.00	84 100.00
Total	1 1.19	83 98.81	84 100.00

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 12 (cont'd)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 3.1 - Attendance

TABLE OF SEX BY ATT

SEX(Gender) / ATT(Attended 30 or More Days)	YES	Total
F	34	34
Frequency	34	34
Percent	40.48	40.48
Row Pct	100.00	
Col Pct	40.48	
M	50	50
Frequency	50	50
Percent	59.52	59.52
Row Pct	100.00	
Col Pct	59.52	
Total	84	84
	100.00	100.00

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 12 (cont'd)
1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 3.1 - Attendance

TABLE 1 OF ATT BY ETHNIC
CONTROLLING FOR SEX=F

ATT(Attended 30 or More Days)
ETHNIC(Ethnic Group)

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Non-Minority	Black	Total
YES	1 2.94 2.94 100.00	33 97.06 97.06 100.00	34 100.00
Total	1 2.94	33 97.06	34 100.00

TABLE 2 OF ATT BY ETHNIC
CONTROLLING FOR SEX=M

ATT(Attended 30 or More Days)
ETHNIC(Ethnic Group)

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Non-Minority	Black	Total
YES	0 0.00 0.00 .	50 100.00 100.00 100.00	50 100.00
Total	0 0.00	50 100.00	50 100.00

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 12 (cont'd)
1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 3.1 - Attendance

TABLE OF COMPL BY SEX

COMPL(Completion) SEX(Gender)

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	F	M	Total
NO	9	16	25
	10.71	19.05	29.76
	36.00	64.00	
	26.47	32.00	
YES	25	34	59
	29.76	40.48	70.24
	42.37	57.63	
	73.53	68.00	
Total	34	50	84
	40.48	59.52	100.00

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 12 (cont'd)
1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 3.1 - Attendance

TABLE OF COMPL BY ETHNIC

COMPL(Completion) ETHNIC(Ethnic Group)

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Non-Minority	Black	Total
NO	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	25 29.76 100.00 30.12	25 29.76
YES	1 1.19 1.69 100.00	58 69.05 98.31 69.88	59 70.24
Total	1 1.19	83 98.81	84 100.00

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 13
1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 3.2 - Male/Black Retention

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	50	100.0	50	100.0

Ethnic Group

ETHNIC	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Black	50	100.0	50	100.0

Gender

SEX	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
M	50	100.0	50	100.0

Completion

COMPL	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	16	32.0	16	32.0
YES	34	68.0	50	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 13 (cont'd)
1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 3.2 - Male/Black Retention

TABLE OF ATT BY ETHNIC

ATT(Attended 30 or More Days)
ETHNIC(Ethnic Group)

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Black	Total
YES	50 100.00 100.00 100.00	50 100.00
Total	50 100.00	50 100.00

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

83

Table 13 (cont'd)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 3.2 - Male/Black Retention

TABLE OF COMPL BY ETHNIC

COMPL(Completion)
ETHNIC(Ethnic Group)

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Black	Total
NO	16 32.00 100.00 32.00	16 32.00
YES	34 68.00 100.00 68.00	34 68.00
Total	50 100.00	50 100.00

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 14

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 3.3 - Non-Minority

Attended 30 or More Days

ATT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
YES	84	100.0	84	100.0

Ethnic Group

ETHNIC	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Non-Minority	1	1.2	1	1.2
Black	83	98.8	84	100.0

Gender

SEX	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
F	34	40.5	34	40.5
M	50	59.5	84	100.0

Completion

COMPL	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	25	29.8	25	29.8
YES	59	70.2	84	100.0

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 14 (cont'd)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 3.3 - Non-Minority

TABLE OF ATT BY ETHNIC

ATT(Attended 30 or More Days)
ETHNIC(Ethnic Group)

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Non-Minority	Black	Total
YES	1 1.19 1.19 100.00	83 98.81 98.81 100.00	84 100.00
Total	1 1.19	83 98.81	84 100.00

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Table 14 (cont'd)
1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE 3.3 - Non-Minority

TABLE OF COMPL BY ETHNIC

COMPL(Completion) ETHNIC(Ethnic Group)

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	Non-Minority	Black	Total
NO	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	25 29.76 100.00 30.12	25 29.76
YES	1 1.19 1.69 100.00	58 69.05 98.31 69.88	59 70.24
Total	1 1.19	83 98.81	84 100.00

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Appendix

PIC 1993 SUMMER PROGRAM

PUPIL CENSUS FORM

PIC Student Name _____ PIC Room 119

PIC Student Number _____

CPS Student Number _____ Ethnic Group Membership (circle one)

Sex F Grade 9 Birth Date 090978 1 - Non-Minority (2 - Black)

Total Days of Program Attendance 36 Days. 3 - Spanish Surname 4 - Asian

Total Days of Program Enrollment 39 Days. 5 - American Indian

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING FORM

1. Enter PIC room number.
2. Enter Columbus Public School student number.
3. Enter grade (grade last year).
4. Verify preprinted values (name, PIC student number, sex, and birth date). (Write in changes above preprinted values.)
5. Circle the appropriate ethnic group.
6. Enter total days of attendance by this pupil.
7. Enter total days this pupil was enrolled in the Summer Program this year. (Note: days of enrollment must be greater than or equal to days of attendance.)
8. In the graphic below, use an "X" (as appropriate) to indicate both "Program" and "Instructional-Content Area" for this pupil: e.g., a pupil in the STEP program receiving Language Mechanics instruction should have an "X" in the row STEP, under the column heading Language Mechanics.

   Use an "X" to indicate each content area in which this pupil receives instruction. An "X" may appear in more than one column but in only one row.

PROGRAM	CONTENT AREA: Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	Mathematics Computation
FAST TRACK	X	X	-
STEP	-	-	-
FAST TRACK 2			-

PIC 1993 SUMMER PROGRAM

P U P I L C E N S U S F O R M

(File-Folder Copy)

PIC Student Name _____ PIC Room 119

PIC Student Number ___

CPS Student Number _____

Sex M Grade 09 Birth Date 052677

Total Days of Program Attendance 39 Days.

Total Days of Program Enrollment 39 Days.

ETHNIC GROUP MEMBERSHIP (circled)

1 - Non-Minority 2 - Black

3 - Spanish Surname 4 - Asian

5 - American Indian

CONTENT AREA

PROGRAM	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	Mathematics Computation
Fast Track	X	X	
Fast Track II			
Step			

C T B S TESTING RESULTS

(Grade Equivalent Values)

	Pretest	Posttest	Change
Reading Comprehension	4.0	4.0	0.0
Language Mechanics	4.0	4.0	0.0
Math Computation	4.6	4.3	-0.3

***** COMPLETION STATUS *****

Criterion	Status
Attendance (30 Day Min.)	YES
CTBS Grade-Equivalent Gain (GE>=1.0)	NO
Program Completion	NO

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog foldrpcf)

Run Date: 24AUG93

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

All FAST TRACK Data - FTK + FT2 SASDATA Files

Assess Data with Respect to Evaluation Proposed Objectives
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Incoming Data

OBS	SEX	ETHNIC	ATTEND	ATT	AGEGR	AGEGRPLA	SPROGRAM	GERCA	GERCB	RCG	GELMA	GELMB	LMG	GEMCA	GEMCB	MCG	COMPL
1	F	Black	36.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK	5.3	5.6	NO	4.0	4.8	NO	7.2	7.2	NO	NO
2	F	Black	7.0	NO	7	6	FAST TRACK	7.7	.	NO	4.0	.	NO	6.4	.	NO	NO
3	F	Black	24.0	NO	8	7	FAST TRACK II	9.9	.	NO	5.3	.	NO	9.3	.	NO	NO
4	M	Black	32.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK II	9.6	12.9	YES	7.9	6.7	NO	7.7	4.3	NO	YES
5	M	Black	2.0	NO	9	8	FAST TRACK II	6.0	.	NO	4.0	.	NO	6.4	.	NO	NO
6	F	Black	36.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	8.3	8.1	NO	4.5	7.9	YES	6.1	6.6	NO	YES
7	F	Black	4.0	NO	11	10	FAST TRACK	6.2	.	NO	6.1	.	NO	8.5	.	NO	NO
8	M		.	NO	7	6		5.0	.	NO	5.0	.	NO	4.3	.	NO	NO
9	F	Black	27.0	NO	9	8	FAST TRACK II	10.5	.	NO	9.5	.	NO	8.2	.	NO	NO
10	F	Black	36.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	6.9	9.6	YES	5.3	12.9	YES	7.3	7.8	NO	YES
11	F		.	NO	8	7		9.3	.	NO	12.9	.	NO	10.3	.	NO	NO
12	M	Black	38.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	9.3	6.9	NO	6.1	12.9	YES	7.7	6.6	NO	YES
13	M	Black	38.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK	8.1	5.7	NO	9.0	10.8	YES	7.5	8.1	NO	YES
14	F	Black	25.0	NO	9	8	FAST TRACK	12.2	.	NO	6.1	.	NO	7.8	.	NO	NO
15	F	Black	36.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK	4.0	5.0	YES	4.0	4.0	NO	4.3	4.3	NO	YES
16	M	Black	37.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	6.2	5.8	NO	6.7	6.1	NO	6.4	5.8	NO	NO
17	M	Black	39.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	5.2	4.7	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	4.3	5.8	YES	YES
18	M	Black	29.0	NO	8	7	FAST TRACK	6.9	5.0	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	7.5	7.4	NO	NO
19	M	Black	31.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	5.8	9.1	YES	4.0	12.9	YES	6.1	5.4	NO	YES
20	M	Black	31.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	5.6	.	NO	4.0	.	NO	6.8	.	NO	NO
21	M		.	NO	9	8		12.2	.	NO	10.8	.	NO	9.3	.	NO	NO
22	F	Black	34.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK II	10.5	12.2	YES	7.9	7.3	NO	6.8	7.2	NO	YES
23	M	Black	32.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK II	4.0	4.7	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	6.1	7.0	NO	NO
24	M	Black	36.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	4.0	4.0	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	4.3	5.8	YES	YES
25	F	Black	39.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK	12.9	12.9	NO	8.4	10.8	YES	7.8	8.1	NO	YES
26	F	Black	38.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK II	4.3	4.0	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	4.3	6.1	YES	YES
27	M	Black	36.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	5.8	9.1	YES	4.0	11.8	YES	5.0	5.0	NO	YES
28	F	Black	33.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK II	9.3	8.3	NO	5.6	7.3	YES	7.5	7.5	NO	YES
29	M	Black	39.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	5.4	9.9	YES	6.1	12.9	YES	8.3	8.7	NO	YES
30	F	Black	23.0	NO	8	7	FAST TRACK II	12.2	12.2	NO	4.8	5.3	NO	5.8	7.7	YES	NO
31	M	Black	37.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	5.7	9.3	YES	4.0	10.8	YES	6.4	5.4	NO	YES
32	F	Black	39.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK	12.2	9.6	NO	12.9	12.9	NO	11.1	11.1	NO	NO
33	M	Black	33.0	YES	9	8	FAST TRACK	4.6	4.0	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	4.3	4.6	NO	NO
34	M	Black	38.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	4.0	5.8	YES	4.0	4.0	NO	4.3	7.0	YES	YES
35	M	Black	24.0	NO	7	6	FAST TRACK	6.2	6.2	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	7.2	6.8	NO	NO
36	M	Black	37.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	7.7	4.9	NO	4.5	6.1	YES	8.5	8.1	NO	YES
37	F	Black	37.5	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK	12.9	12.9	NO	10.1	11.8	YES	8.0	7.8	NO	YES
38	M	Black	33.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK	12.9	12.9	NO	10.8	12.9	YES	9.6	11.1	YES	YES
39	F	Black	2.0	NO	7	6	FAST TRACK II	7.7	.	NO	5.0	.	NO	6.4	.	NO	NO
40	F	Black	26.0	NO	9	8	FAST TRACK II	12.9	12.9	NO	12.9	12.9	NO	8.7	11.1	YES	NO
41	F	Black	35.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	10.5	12.9	YES	12.9	12.9	NO	12.5	11.1	NO	YES
42	F	Black	33.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	5.0	5.0	NO	4.0	12.9	YES	7.3	6.4	NO	YES

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

All FAST TRACK Data - FTK + FT2 SASDATA Files

Assess Data with Respect to Evaluation Proposed Objectives
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Incoming Data

OBS	SEX	ETHNIC	ATTEND	ATT	AGEGR	AGEGRPLA	SPROGRAM	GERCA	GERCB	RCG	GELMA	GELMB	LMG	GEMCA	GEMCB	MCG	COMPL
43	M	Black	31.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	8.1	4.0	NO	8.4	7.9	NO	7.5	5.8	NO	NO
44	M	Black	38.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	9.3	7.3	NO	6.7	10.8	YES	7.3	6.4	NO	YES
45	M	Black	37.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	12.9	12.9	NO	8.4	9.0	NO	11.7	8.5	NO	NO
46	F	.	.	NO	8	7		5.8	.	NO	5.3	.	NO	6.1	.	NO	NO
47	M	Black	37.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	9.3	9.3	NO	7.3	8.4	YES	7.8	8.2	NO	YES
48	F	Black	38.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK II	8.3	8.9	NO	4.8	6.1	YES	6.6	7.2	NO	YES
49	M	Black	30.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	4.0	12.9	YES	4.0	6.1	YES	4.6	7.3	YES	YES
50	F	Black	19.0	NO	7	6	FAST TRACK	9.9	.	NO	4.0	.	NO	6.8	.	NO	NO
51	M	Black	21.0	NO	7	6	FAST TRACK	5.2	.	NO	5.3	.	NO	7.8	.	NO	NO
52	M	Black	32.0	YES	9	8	FAST TRACK II	8.3	7.3	NO	4.3	4.0	NO	7.3	7.2	NO	NO
53	F	Black	37.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	6.9	8.1	YES	10.1	9.5	NO	8.7	8.7	NO	YES
54	M	Black	5.0	NO	8	7	FAST TRACK	4.3	.	NO	4.0	.	NO	5.8	.	NO	NO
55	M	Black	34.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK	5.3	5.4	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	5.4	4.3	NO	NO
56	F	Black	10.0	NO	8	7	FAST TRACK	6.5	.	NO	4.0	.	NO	5.4	.	NO	NO
57	M	Black	34.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	4.3	4.0	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	7.3	7.2	NO	NO
58	M	.	.	NO	9	8		5.4	.	NO	5.3	.	NO	6.8	.	NO	NO
59	F	Black	34.0	YES	9	8	FAST TRACK	9.9	10.5	NO	7.9	7.9	NO	8.7	12.9	YES	YES
60	M	Black	35.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	10.5	9.6	NO	4.5	4.0	NO	7.3	7.2	NO	NO
61	M	Black	37.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK II	4.0	4.7	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	4.3	6.4	YES	YES
62	F	Non-Minority	39.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK II	10.5	12.9	YES	12.9	11.8	NO	6.8	8.1	YES	YES
63	M	Black	39.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	4.7	5.6	NO	4.0	4.5	NO	4.3	4.3	NO	NO
64	M	.	.	NO	8	7		12.9	.	NO	10.1	.	NO	9.3	.	NO	NO
65	F	Black	33.0	YES	9	8	FAST TRACK	7.3	9.1	YES	9.0	8.4	NO	.	7.4	NO	YES
66	F	Black	33.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	9.6	12.9	YES	7.9	6.1	NO	6.6	7.0	NO	YES
67	F	Black	28.0	NO	7	6	FAST TRACK II	12.9	12.9	NO	12.9	12.9	NO	8.5	8.9	NO	NO
68	M	Black	34.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK	8.9	12.2	YES	8.4	11.8	YES	5.4	5.4	NO	YES
69	F	Black	29.0	NO	8	7	FAST TRACK II	4.0	4.0	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	4.3	5.0	NO	NO
70	F	Black	26.0	NO	8	7	FAST TRACK	4.0	4.0	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	6.4	5.8	NO	NO
71	M	Black	38.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK	8.9	5.7	NO	5.6	8.4	YES	7.8	6.6	NO	YES
72	M	Black	33.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	8.1	6.9	NO	7.3	11.8	YES	6.1	6.8	NO	YES
73	F	Black	24.0	NO	8	7	FAST TRACK II	4.0	.	NO	5.0	.	NO	6.4	.	NO	NO
74	M	Black	16.0	NO	8	7	FAST TRACK	5.8	.	NO	4.0	.	NO	6.1	.	NO	NO
75	M	Black	28.0	NO	7	6	FAST TRACK II	5.8	12.2	YES	6.1	12.9	YES	8.9	10.3	YES	NO
76	M	Black	30.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	5.3	6.5	YES	4.3	4.5	NO	7.5	7.4	NO	YES
77	F	.	.	NO	8	7		5.8	.	NO	5.3	.	NO	11.1	.	NO	NO
78	F	Black	35.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK	4.0	5.0	YES	4.0	4.0	NO	6.8	7.5	NO	YES
79	F	Black	39.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	6.0	6.5	NO	11.8	10.1	NO	8.7	8.7	NO	NO
80	M	Black	37.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	8.7	9.1	NO	5.3	11.8	YES	5.4	5.8	NO	YES
81	M	Black	31.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK	5.6	.	NO	4.0	.	NO	7.0	.	NO	NO
82	M	Black	32.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	6.0	9.3	YES	5.3	12.9	YES	4.3	6.1	YES	YES
83	M	Black	36.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	8.5	7.7	NO	5.6	10.8	YES	6.4	6.6	NO	YES
84	M	Black	34.0	YES	9	8	FAST TRACK II	12.2	9.9	NO	10.1	12.9	YES	8.5	8.5	NO	YES

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

All FAST TRACK Data - FTK + FT2 SASDATA Files

Assess Data with Respect to Evaluation Proposed Objectives
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Incoming Data

OBS	SEX	ETHNIC	ATTEND	ATT	AGEGR	AGEGRPLA	SPROGRAM	GERCA	GERCB	RCG	GELMA	GELMB	LMG	GEMCA	GEMCB	MCG	COMPL
85	F	Black	37.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK	8.1	7.3	NO	4.0	9.0	YES	7.0	6.1	NO	YES
86	F	Black	36.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK II	5.4	9.9	YES	4.0	11.8	YES	6.4	6.6	NO	YES
87	M	Black	37.5	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK	8.9	10.5	YES	7.3	12.9	YES	8.3	7.8	NO	YES
88	F	Black	39.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK	7.3	12.9	YES	4.5	10.1	YES	6.8	7.4	NO	YES
89	M	Black	39.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	5.6	8.7	YES	5.0	8.4	YES	8.3	7.3	NO	YES
90	M	Black	33.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	8.3	4.7	NO	6.1	4.0	NO	7.2	6.6	NO	NO
91	F	Black	39.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	7.7	8.9	YES	4.3	8.4	YES	7.2	6.4	NO	YES
92	M	Black	9.0	NO	7	6	FAST TRACK II	5.7	.	NO	4.0	.	NO	4.3	.	NO	NO
93	F	Black	38.0	YES	9	8	FAST TRACK II	12.9	12.9	NO	10.1	12.9	YES	11.1	12.5	YES	YES
94	F	Black	33.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK II	8.1	9.1	YES	9.5	6.1	NO	7.5	8.1	NO	YES
95	M	Black	33.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK II	5.4	8.9	YES	7.9	10.1	YES	6.4	6.6	NO	YES
96	F	Black	37.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK	9.3	9.3	NO	8.4	12.9	YES	9.3	8.7	NO	YES
97	M	Black	34.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	4.0	4.0	NO	4.0	4.3	NO	6.1	5.8	NO	NO
98	F	Black	37.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK II	4.0	4.0	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	4.3	5.0	NO	NO
99	M	Black	38.5	YES	9	8	FAST TRACK	4.0	4.0	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	4.3	5.4	YES	YES
100	F	Black	21.0	NO	7	6	FAST TRACK	8.7	.	NO	7.9	.	NO	7.2	.	NO	NO
101	F	Black	37.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	5.4	5.7	NO	4.0	4.8	NO	7.3	8.1	NO	NO
102	M	Black	27.0	NO	8	7	FAST TRACK II	5.6	9.6	YES	5.0	12.9	YES	6.1	6.1	NO	NO
103	M	Black	12.0	NO	8	7	FAST TRACK	12.9	.	NO	9.5	.	NO	8.5	.	NO	NO
104	M	Non-Minority	23.0	NO	8	7	FAST TRACK II	9.3	8.9	NO	9.5	9.5	NO	9.3	8.3	NO	NO
105	F	Black	1.0	NO	7	6	FAST TRACK	9.3	.	NO	11.8	.	NO	7.7	.	NO	NO
106	M	Black	37.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	8.3	6.0	NO	4.8	10.1	YES	5.0	6.8	YES	YES
107	F	Black	35.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	8.9	6.9	NO	5.3	4.3	NO	6.1	4.3	NO	NO
108	F	Black	39.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	4.7	8.7	YES	7.3	12.9	YES	4.6	5.8	YES	YES
109	F	Black	39.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK II	6.2	6.5	NO	9.0	9.5	NO	7.5	7.2	NO	NO
110	F	Black	14.0	NO	8	7	FAST TRACK	6.0	.	NO	4.0	.	NO	5.0	.	NO	NO
111	M	Black	37.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	5.3	9.6	YES	4.0	10.1	YES	6.1	6.4	NO	YES
112	M	Black	37.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	12.9	4.0	NO	10.1	4.0	NO	7.4	4.6	NO	NO
113	M	Black	37.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK II	5.2	4.7	NO	5.0	4.8	NO	7.2	7.2	NO	NO
114	F	Black	34.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK	12.2	9.6	NO	4.5	5.0	NO	7.5	7.8	NO	NO
115	M	Black	32.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK II	6.0	6.2	NO	4.0	5.6	YES	6.4	5.0	NO	YES
116	M	Black	34.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK II	9.3	9.9	NO	12.9	12.9	NO	12.9	12.9	NO	NO
117	M	Black	37.0	YES	8	7	FAST TRACK II	8.7	8.3	NO	5.6	7.9	YES	8.3	7.3	NO	YES
118	M	Black	33.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	6.5	8.5	YES	5.6	12.9	YES	7.0	7.3	NO	YES
119	F	Black	17.0	NO	8	7	FAST TRACK	9.6	.	NO	9.5	.	NO	7.7	.	NO	NO
120	M	Black	38.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	4.0	8.9	YES	4.0	10.1	YES	5.4	6.1	NO	YES
121	F	Black	28.0	NO	8	7	FAST TRACK	4.7	5.4	NO	4.5	6.1	YES	8.1	7.5	NO	NO
122	F	Black	28.5	NO	8	7	FAST TRACK	4.3	4.0	NO	5.6	4.5	NO	6.1	7.4	YES	NO
123	F	Black	27.0	NO	7	6	FAST TRACK	6.2	5.0	NO	5.6	4.0	NO	6.6	5.0	NO	NO
124	M	Black	39.0	YES	9	8	FAST TRACK	4.0	4.0	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	4.6	4.3	NO	NO
125	F	Black	37.0	YES	7	6	FAST TRACK	12.2	12.9	NO	10.8	7.9	NO	7.3	8.1	NO	NO

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

All FAST TRACK Data - FTK + FT2 SASDATA Files

Assess Data with Respect to Evaluation Proposed Objectives
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Incoming Data

N = 125

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

All FAST TRACK Data - FTK + FT2 SASDATA Files

Assess Data with Respect to Evaluation Proposed Objectives
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

More Incoming Data - Content Area

OBS	CONTARE1	CONTARE2	CONTARE3
1	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
2	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
3	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
4	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
5	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
6	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
7	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
8			
9	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
10	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
11			
12	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
13	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
14	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
15	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
16	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
17	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
18	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
19	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
20	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
21			
22	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
23	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
24	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
25	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
26	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
27	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
28	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
29	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
30	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
31	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
32	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
33	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
34	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
35	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
36	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
37	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
38	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
39	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
40	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
41	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
42	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

All FAST TRACK Data - FTK + FT2 SASDATA Files

Assess Data with Respect to Evaluation Proposed Objectives
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

More Incoming Data - Content Area

OBS	CONTARE1	CONTARE2	CONTARE3
43	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
44	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
45	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
46			
47	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
48	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
49	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
50	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
51	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
52	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
53	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
54	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
55	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
56	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
57	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
58			
59	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
60	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
61	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
62	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
63	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
64			
65	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
66	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
67	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
68	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
69	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
70	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
71	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
72	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
73	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
74	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
75	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
76	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
77			
78	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
79	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
80	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
81	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
82	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
83	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
84	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

All FAST TRACK Data - FTK + FT2 SASDATA Files

Assess Data with Respect to Evaluation Proposed Objectives
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

More Incoming Data - Content Area

OBS	CONTARE1	CONTARE2	CONTARE3
85	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
86	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
87	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
88	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
89	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
90	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
91	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
92	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
93	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
94	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
95	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
96	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
97	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
98	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
99	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
100	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
101	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
102	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
103	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
104	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
105	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
106	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
107	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
108	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
109	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
110	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
111	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
112	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
113	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
114	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
115	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
116	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
117	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
118	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
119	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
120	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
121	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
122			
123	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
124	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
125	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

All FAST TRACK Data - FTK + FT2 SASDATA Files

Assess Data with Respect to Evaluation Proposed Objectives
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

More Incoming Data - Content Area

N = 125

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Data Used for Analysis - Valid Attendance and Post-CTBS

OBS	SEX	ETHNIC	ATTEND	ATT	AGEGR	GERCA	GERCB	RCG	GELMA	GELMB	LMG	GEMCA	GEMCB	MCG	COMPL
1	F	Black	36.0	YES	8	5.3	5.6	NO	4.0	4.8	NO	7.2	7.2	NO	NO
2	M	Black	37.0	YES	7	6.2	5.8	NO	6.7	6.1	NO	6.4	5.8	NO	NO
3	M	Black	32.0	YES	8	4.0	4.7	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	6.1	7.0	NO	NO
4	F	Black	39.0	YES	8	12.2	9.6	NO	12.9	12.9	NO	11.1	11.1	NO	NO
5	M	Black	33.0	YES	9	4.6	4.0	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	4.3	4.6	NO	NO
6	M	Black	31.0	YES	7	8.1	4.0	NO	8.4	7.9	NO	7.5	5.8	NO	NO
7	M	Black	37.0	YES	7	12.9	12.9	NO	8.4	9.0	NO	11.7	8.5	NO	NO
8	M	Black	32.0	YES	9	8.3	7.3	NO	4.3	4.0	NO	7.3	7.2	NO	NO
9	M	Black	34.0	YES	8	5.3	5.4	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	5.4	4.3	NO	NO
10	M	Black	34.0	YES	7	4.3	4.0	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	7.3	7.2	NO	NO
11	M	Black	35.0	YES	7	10.5	9.6	NO	4.5	4.0	NO	7.3	7.2	NO	NO
12	M	Black	39.0	YES	7	4.7	5.6	NO	4.0	4.5	NO	4.3	4.3	NO	NO
13	F	Black	39.0	YES	7	6.0	6.5	NO	11.8	10.1	NO	8.7	8.7	NO	NO
14	M	Black	33.0	YES	7	8.3	4.7	NO	6.1	4.0	NO	7.2	6.6	NO	NO
15	M	Black	34.0	YES	7	4.0	4.0	NO	4.0	4.3	NO	6.1	5.8	NO	NO
16	F	Black	37.0	YES	8	4.0	4.0	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	4.3	5.0	NO	NO
17	F	Black	37.0	YES	7	5.4	5.7	NO	4.0	4.8	NO	7.3	8.1	NO	NO
18	F	Black	35.0	YES	7	8.9	6.9	NO	5.3	4.3	NO	6.1	4.3	NO	NO
19	F	Black	39.0	YES	8	6.2	6.5	NO	9.0	9.5	NO	7.5	7.2	NO	NO
20	M	Black	37.0	YES	7	12.9	4.0	NO	10.1	4.0	NO	7.4	4.6	NO	NO
21	M	Black	37.0	YES	8	5.2	4.7	NO	5.0	4.8	NO	7.2	7.2	NO	NO
22	F	Black	34.0	YES	8	12.2	9.6	NO	4.5	5.0	NO	7.5	7.8	NO	NO
23	M	Black	34.0	YES	8	9.3	9.9	NO	12.9	12.9	NO	12.9	12.9	NO	NO
24	M	Black	39.0	YES	9	4.0	4.0	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	4.6	4.3	NO	NO
25	F	Black	37.0	YES	7	12.2	12.9	NO	10.8	7.9	NO	7.3	8.1	NO	NO
26	M	Black	32.0	YES	8	9.6	12.9	YES	7.9	6.7	NO	7.7	4.3	NO	YES
27	F	Black	36.0	YES	7	8.3	8.1	NO	4.5	7.9	YES	6.1	6.6	NO	YES
28	F	Black	36.0	YES	7	6.9	9.6	YES	5.3	12.9	YES	7.3	7.8	NO	YES
29	M	Black	38.0	YES	7	9.3	6.9	NO	6.1	12.9	YES	7.7	6.6	NO	YES
30	M	Black	38.0	YES	8	8.1	5.7	NO	9.0	10.8	YES	7.5	8.1	NO	YES
31	F	Black	36.0	YES	8	4.0	5.0	YES	4.0	4.0	NO	4.3	4.3	NO	YES
32	M	Black	39.0	YES	7	5.2	4.7	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	4.3	5.8	YES	YES
33	M	Black	31.0	YES	7	5.8	9.1	YES	4.0	12.9	YES	6.1	5.4	NO	YES
34	F	Black	34.0	YES	8	10.5	12.2	YES	7.9	7.3	NO	6.8	7.2	NO	YES
35	M	Black	36.0	YES	7	4.0	4.0	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	4.3	5.8	YES	YES
36	F	Black	39.0	YES	8	12.9	12.9	NO	8.4	10.8	YES	7.8	8.1	NO	YES
37	F	Black	38.0	YES	8	4.3	4.0	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	4.3	6.1	YES	YES
38	M	Black	36.0	YES	7	5.8	9.1	YES	4.0	11.8	YES	5.0	5.0	NO	YES
39	F	Black	33.0	YES	8	9.3	8.3	NO	5.6	7.3	YES	7.5	7.5	NO	YES
40	M	Black	39.0	YES	7	5.4	9.9	YES	6.1	12.9	YES	8.3	8.7	NO	YES
41	M	Black	37.0	YES	7	5.7	9.3	YES	4.0	10.8	YES	6.4	5.4	NO	YES
42	M	Black	38.0	YES	7	4.0	5.8	YES	4.0	4.0	NO	4.3	7.0	YES	YES

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Data Used for Analysis - Valid Attendance and Post-CTBS

OBS	SEX	ETHNIC	ATTEND	ATT	AGEGR	GERCA	GERCB	RCG	GELMA	GELMB	LMG	GEMCA	GEMCB	MCG	COMPL
43	M	Black	37.0	YES	7	7.7	4.9	NO	4.5	6.1	YES	8.5	8.1	NO	YES
44	F	Black	37.5	YES	8	12.9	12.9	NO	10.1	11.8	YES	8.0	7.8	NO	YES
45	M	Black	33.0	YES	8	12.9	12.9	NO	10.8	12.9	YES	9.6	11.1	YES	YES
46	F	Black	35.0	YES	7	10.5	12.9	YES	12.9	12.9	NO	12.5	11.1	NO	YES
47	F	Black	33.0	YES	7	5.0	5.0	NO	4.0	12.9	YES	7.3	6.4	NO	YES
48	M	Black	38.0	YES	7	9.3	7.3	NO	6.7	10.8	YES	7.3	6.4	NO	YES
49	M	Black	37.0	YES	7	9.3	9.3	NO	7.3	8.4	YES	7.8	8.2	NO	YES
50	F	Black	38.0	YES	8	8.3	8.9	NO	4.8	6.1	YES	6.6	7.2	NO	YES
51	M	Black	30.0	YES	7	4.0	12.9	YES	4.0	6.1	YES	4.6	7.3	YES	YES
52	F	Black	37.0	YES	7	6.9	8.1	YES	10.1	9.5	NO	8.7	8.7	NO	YES
53	F	Black	34.0	YES	9	9.9	10.5	NO	7.9	7.9	NO	8.7	12.9	YES	YES
54	M	Black	37.0	YES	8	4.0	4.7	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	4.3	6.4	YES	YES
55	F	Non-Minority	39.0	YES	8	10.5	12.9	YES	12.9	11.8	NO	6.8	8.1	YES	YES
56	F	Black	33.0	YES	9	7.3	9.1	YES	9.0	8.4	NO	.	7.4	NO	YES
57	F	Black	33.0	YES	7	9.6	12.9	YES	7.9	6.1	NO	6.6	7.0	NO	YES
58	M	Black	34.0	YES	8	8.9	12.2	YES	8.4	11.8	YES	5.4	5.4	NO	YES
59	M	Black	38.0	YES	8	8.9	5.7	NO	5.6	8.4	YES	7.8	6.6	NO	YES
60	M	Black	33.0	YES	7	8.1	6.9	NO	7.3	11.8	YES	6.1	6.8	NO	YES
61	M	Black	30.0	YES	7	5.3	6.5	YES	4.3	4.5	NO	7.5	7.4	NO	YES
62	F	Black	35.0	YES	8	4.0	5.0	YES	4.0	4.0	NO	6.8	7.5	NO	YES
63	M	Black	37.0	YES	7	8.7	9.1	NO	5.3	11.8	YES	5.4	5.8	NO	YES
64	M	Black	32.0	YES	7	6.0	9.3	YES	5.3	12.9	YES	4.3	6.1	YES	YES
65	M	Black	36.0	YES	7	8.5	7.7	NO	5.6	10.8	YES	6.4	6.6	NO	YES
66	M	Black	34.0	YES	9	12.2	9.9	NO	10.1	12.9	YES	8.5	8.5	NO	YES
67	F	Black	37.0	YES	8	8.1	7.3	NO	4.0	9.0	YES	7.0	6.1	NO	YES
68	F	Black	36.0	YES	8	5.4	9.9	YES	4.0	11.8	YES	6.4	6.6	NO	YES
69	M	Black	37.5	YES	8	8.9	10.5	YES	7.3	12.9	YES	8.3	7.8	NO	YES
70	F	Black	39.0	YES	8	7.3	12.9	YES	4.5	10.1	YES	6.8	7.4	NO	YES
71	M	Black	39.0	YES	7	5.6	8.7	YES	5.0	8.4	YES	8.3	7.3	NO	YES
72	F	Black	39.0	YES	7	7.7	8.9	YES	4.3	8.4	YES	7.2	6.4	NO	YES
73	F	Black	38.0	YES	9	12.9	12.9	NO	10.1	12.9	YES	11.1	12.5	YES	YES
74	F	Black	33.0	YES	8	8.1	9.1	YES	9.5	6.1	NO	7.5	8.1	NO	YES
75	M	Black	33.0	YES	8	5.4	8.9	YES	7.9	10.1	YES	6.4	6.6	NO	YES
76	F	Black	37.0	YES	8	9.3	9.3	NO	8.4	12.9	YES	9.3	8.7	NO	YES
77	M	Black	38.5	YES	9	4.0	4.0	NO	4.0	4.0	NO	4.3	5.4	YES	YES
78	M	Black	37.0	YES	7	8.3	6.0	NO	4.8	10.1	YES	5.0	6.8	YES	YES
79	F	Black	39.0	YES	7	4.7	8.7	YES	7.3	12.9	YES	4.6	5.8	YES	YES
80	M	Black	37.0	YES	7	5.3	9.6	YES	4.0	10.1	YES	6.1	6.4	NO	YES
81	M	Black	32.0	YES	7	6.0	6.2	NO	4.0	5.6	YES	6.4	5.0	NO	YES
82	M	Black	37.0	YES	8	8.7	8.3	NO	5.6	7.9	YES	8.3	7.3	NO	YES
83	M	Black	33.0	YES	7	6.5	8.5	YES	5.6	12.9	YES	7.0	7.3	NO	YES
84	M	Black	38.0	YES	7	4.0	8.9	YES	4.0	10.1	YES	5.4	6.1	NO	YES

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

Data Used for Analysis - Valid Attendance and Post-CTBS

N = 84

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

More Analysis Data - Content Area

OBS	CONTARE1	CONTARE2	CONTARE3
1	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
2	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
3	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
4	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
5	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
6	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
7	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
8	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
9	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
10	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
11	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
12	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
13	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
14	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
15	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
16	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
17	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
18	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
19	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
20	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
21	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
22	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
23	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
24	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
25	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
26	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
27	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
28	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
29	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
30	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
31	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
32	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
33	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
34	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
35	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
36	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
37	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
38	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
39	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
40	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
41	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
42	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

More Analysis Data - Content Area

OBS	CONTARE1	CONTARE2	CONTARE3
43	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
44	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
45	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
46	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
47	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
48	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
49	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
50	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
51	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
52	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
53	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
54	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
55	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
56	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
57	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
58	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
59	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
60	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
61	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
62	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
63	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
64	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
65	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
66	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
67	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
68	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
69	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
70	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
71	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
72	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
73	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
74	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
75	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
76	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
77	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
78	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
79	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
80	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
81	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
82	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
83	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	
84	Reading Comprehension	Language Mechanics	

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

1993 PIC DATA ANALYSIS

<<<<< EVALUATION SAMPLE - Fast Track Data >>>>>

ATTEND>=30 Days, Valid CTBS Pretest and Posttest Scores (At Least One Pair)
See the PIC Proposal, "7. Evaluation"

More Analysis Data - Content Area

N = 84

Input File: ALLFTK93 SASDATA A

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog picevalo)

Print File Folder PCF Forms from File MRGFT293 RAWDATA A

"Impossible" Completions (at least one PRETEST GE >=12.0)

OBS	NUNAME	SN	PICROOM	GRADE	SPROGRAM	GERCA	GERCB	GELMA	GELMB	GEMCA	GEMCB	ATTEND	CATTEND	ENROLL	CPROGRAM
48		231	123	08	FAST TRACK II	12.2	12.2	4.8	5.3	5.8	7.7	23	NO	39	NO
49		203	123	10	FAST TRACK II	12.9	12.9	12.9	12.9	8.7	11.1	26	NO	39	NO
50		257	123	08	FAST TRACK II	10.5	12.9	12.9	12.9	12.5	11.1	35	YES	39	YES
52		220	123	09	FAST TRACK II	10.5	12.9	12.9	11.8	6.8	8.1	39	YES	39	YES
53		245	123	08	FAST TRACK II	12.9	12.9	12.9	12.9	8.5	8.9	28	NO	39	NO
54		210	123	10	FAST TRACK II	12.2	9.9	10.1	12.9	8.5	8.5	34	YES	39	YES
55		223	123	09	FAST TRACK II	12.9	12.9	10.1	12.9	11.1	12.5	38	YES	39	YES
58		214	123	09	FAST TRACK II	9.3	9.9	12.9	12.9	12.9	12.9	34	YES	39	NO

N = 8

12 2 0

5 5 2

17 7 2

=26

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation
(picprog foldrpcf)

Print File Folder PCF Forms from File MRGFTK93 RAWDATA A

"Impossible" Completions (at least one PRETEST GE >=12.0)

OBS	NUNAME	SN	PICROOM	GRADE	SPROGRAM	GERCA	GERCB	GELMA	GELMB	GEMCA	GEMCB	ATTEND	CATTEND	ENROLL	CPROGRAM
2		005				9.3		12.9		10.3			NO		NO
3		033				12.2		10.8		9.3			NO		NO
5		040				12.9		10.1		9.3			NO		NO
9		006	117	10	FAST TRACK	12.2		6.1		7.8		25	NO	39	NO
56		055	123	09	FAST TRACK	12.9	12.9	8.4	10.8	7.8	8.1	39	YES	39	YES
57		046	123	08	FAST TRACK	12.2	9.6	12.9	12.9	11.1	11.1	39	YES	39	NO
58		037	123	09	FAST TRACK	12.9	12.9	10.1	11.8	8.0	7.8	37.5	YES	39	YES
59		058	123	09	FAST TRACK	12.9	12.9	10.8	12.9	9.6	11.1	33	YES	39	YES
60		022	123	08	FAST TRACK	12.9	12.9	8.4	9.0	11.7	8.5	37	YES	39	NO
62		056	123	09	FAST TRACK	12.9		9.5		8.5		12	NO	39	NO
64		053	123	08	FAST TRACK	12.9	4.0	10.1	4.0	7.4	4.6	37	YES	39	NO
65		255	123	09	FAST TRACK	12.2	9.6	4.5	5.0	7.5	7.8	34	YES	39	NO
67		054	123	08	FAST TRACK	12.2	12.9	10.8	7.9	7.3	8.1	37	YES	39	NO

N = 13

12 2